arXiv:1411.4581v1 [hep-ex] 17 Nov 2014

November 17, 2014

CKM studies in the charm sector

M.J. Charles[1]

LPNHE, Université Pierre et Marie Curie
Université Paris Diderot, CNRS/IN2P3, Paris, France

A summary of recent progress in charm mixing and CP violation is presented, with a heavy bias towards experimental results.

PRESENTED AT

The 8th International Workshop on the CKM Unitarity Triangle (CKM 2014),
Vienna, Austria, September 8–12, 2014

[1]Work supported by CNRS/IN2P3

1 Introduction

Famously, CKM studies of charm began even before its experimental discovery [1]. The experimental and theoretical context has changed a great deal since then, but the goal today remains the same: to reveal or constrain New Physics (NP) through study of flavour observables. For charm physics this means making precise measurements of CP violation (CPV) and mixing*. CPV in charm is typically divided into two types according to its mechanism: indirect (mixing-induced) and direct. Although both are ultimately driven by CKM physics—at least, within the Standard Model (SM)—they are studied in different ways at both theoretical and experimental levels, and will be discussed separately.

2 Mixing

Charm is far from the only arena where flavour observables can be used to search for NP. In particular, numerous studies of mixing and CPV have been carried out in the b and s sectors. The differences are stark. Mixing occurs at a much higher rate in K^0, B^0, and B_s^0 mesons, as shown in Table 1. The normalised mixing parameters quoted, x and y, are defined via

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma &= \frac{\Gamma_2 + \Gamma_1}{2} \\ x &= \frac{m_2 - m_1}{\Gamma} \\ y &= \frac{\Gamma_2 - \Gamma_1}{\Gamma} \end{aligned}$$

where m_i and Γ_i are the masses and widths of the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian. The overall mixing rate R_M is then given by $R_M = (x^2 + y^2)/2$. For each of the mesons able to mix, this rate is of order 1 or more—except for charm, where it is approximately 3×10^{-5}. This small rate is why it took about three decades from the discovery of charm to the first evidence of mixing [2, 3]. Even so, the mixing parameters are at the upper end of what is plausible within the SM: long-distance effects can generate values of x and y up to $\mathcal{O}(10^{-2})$ [4, 5]. Short-distance effects would be much smaller, with a simple estimate indicating they should enter at the 10^{-5} level [6]; more sophisticated calculations give numbers that are larger but not dramatically so [7]. It should be noted that all calculations of the SM mixing rate to date are at best order-of-magnitude: for all we know, the mixing rates observed could actually be dominated by NP effects. Inverting the argument, the observed level of

* The branching fractions of very rare decays such as $D^0 \to \mu^+\mu^-$ are also sensitive to NP, but are outside the scope of these Proceedings.

Meson	x	y
K^0	9.5	almost 1
D^0	0.0041 ± 0.0015	0.0063 ± 0.0008
B^0	0.774 ± 0.006	0.0005 ± 0.005
B_s^0	26.85 ± 0.13	0.069 ± 0.006

Table 1: Mixing parameters x and y for neutral mesons. Data from HFAG [9] and the PDG [10].

mixing in charm can be used to constrain models of NP by requiring that they at most saturate it [8].

On the experimental side, there are four main sources of information on charm mixing[†]: the time-dependent ratio of wrong-sign (WS) to right-sign (RS) decays, primarily in $D^0 \to K^\pm\pi^\mp$, measuring y_{CP}; the ratio of the mean lifetime seen in CP eigenstates vs. CP-mixed states, primarily $D^0 \to K^-K^+, \pi^-\pi^+$ vs. $K^-\pi^+$, measuring x' and y'[‡]; time-dependent amplitude analyses of Dalitz plots of self-conjugate final states, primarily $D^0 \to K^0_S\pi^+\pi^-$, measuring x and y; and measurements of relative strong phases δ between doubly Cabibbo-suppressed (DCS) and Cabibbo-favoured (CF) decays. In most cases these do not grant direct access to (x, y) but rather combinations of physics parameters (x, y, relative strong phases, indirect CPV), such that the world-average is not dominated by any one type of measurement but rather by their combination. The time-dependent amplitude analyses are the exception: they allow simultaneous measurement of the mixing rate and of the strong phases of the contributing amplitudes, thereby granting direct access to x and y.

The most recent world average results on x and y from HFAG are illustrated in Fig. 1(a). Allowing for CPV, the central values are:

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \left(0.41^{+0.14}_{-0.15}\right)\% \\ y &= \left(0.63^{+0.07}_{-0.08}\right)\% \end{aligned}$$

This represents a major improvement in precision from the status as of CKM 2012. Several new or updated experimental results have been released since then, from Belle [11, 12], CDF [13] LHCb [14, 15], and BESIII [16, 17]. In particular, after many years in which the overall statistical significance of mixing was high but no individual measurement exceeded 5σ, Belle, CDF, and LHCb have now all passed that threshold. The most significant of these results by some way is a measurement

[†] This list is not exhaustive. For example, it omits time-integrated measurements of wrong-sign semileptonic decays.

[‡] x' and y' are related to x and y by rotation through the strong phase δ between the DCS and CF decays to that final state.



(a) (b)

Figure 1: World-average results from HFAG [9], as of 30 June 2014.

with WS $D^0 \to K^+\pi^-$ decays by LHCb: this is an analysis which can capitalise on the large charm cross-section and the boost.

As discussed above, the size of mixing in charm is a powerful constraint on models of NP. However, there is not much more to be learned on this front from experiment: improving the precision on the mixing parameters will not move the upper bound significantly. It is important for another reason, though: relating measurements of time-dependent CP asymmetries to the underlying physics parameters of indirect CP violation requires knowledge of x and y.

3 Indirect CPV

Indirect CPV in charm may be characterised by the magnitude and phase of q/p, with deviation from $|q/p| = 1$ and $\phi \equiv \arg(q/p) = 0$ indicating CPV. In the HFAG phase convention [9], these are related to experimental observables as follows:[§]

$$
\begin{aligned}
2y_{CP} &= (|q/p| + |p/q|)\, y\cos\phi - (|q/p| - |p/q|)\, x\sin\phi \\
2A_\Gamma &= (|q/p| - |p/q|)\, y\cos\phi - (|q/p| + |p/q|)\, x\sin\phi \\
x'^{\pm} &= \left(\frac{1 \pm A_M}{1 \pm A_M}\right)^{1/4} (x'\cos\phi \pm y'\sin\phi)
\end{aligned}
$$

[§] Direct CPV is neglected in these expressions. This is a good approximation at present, but when the precision on A_Γ improves it may need to be taken into account [18].

$$y'^{\pm} = \left(\frac{1 \pm A_M}{1 \pm A_M}\right)^{1/4} (y' \cos\phi \mp x' \sin\phi)$$

where

$$A_M = \frac{|q/p|^2 - |p/q|^2}{|q/p|^2 + |p/q|^2}.$$

Here y_{CP} is the mixing parameter obtained from the ratio of CP-even[¶] to CP-mixed lifetimes, discussed in the previous section. A_Γ is a related asymmetry:

$$A_\Gamma = \frac{\tau(\overline{D}^0 \to f_{CP,+}) - \tau(D^0 \to f_{CP,+})}{\tau(\overline{D}^0 \to f_{CP,+}) + \tau(D^0 \to f_{CP,+})},$$

with the most precise results coming from $D^0 \to K^+K^-$ and $\pi^+\pi^-$. The observables $x'^{\pm}$ and $y'^{\pm}$ are simply the values of x' and y' measured with D^0 and $\overline{D}^0$ events, respectively; a difference between x'^{+} and x'^{-} or y'^{+} and y'^{-} would indicate CPV.

Two key points follow directly from these expressions. First, the observable A_Γ is scaled down by a factor of x or y, such that even if indirect CPV is maximal A_Γ will be limited in magnitude to approximately x or y, i.e. $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{2}\%)$. We have only recently entered a regime where the uncertainty on A_Γ is smaller than this. Second, while a non-zero value of A_Γ would necessarily imply CPV, extracting values or limits on the physics parameters ϕ and $|q/p|$ would require x and y as inputs. Similar considerations apply to $x'^{\pm}$ and $y'^{\pm}$. The relative uncertainties on the mixing parameters are still substantial, although the situation is much better now than a few years ago. Thus, improving the precision with which x and y is known translates directly to improved constraints on the underlying CPV parameters.

Some of the recent mixing measurements noted in Section 2 included measurements of CP asymmetries [11, 15], and in addition LHCb has published a measurement of A_Γ with 1/invfb of data [19]. Including these, the current world-average results with CPV fully allowed are shown in Fig. 1(b), and correspond to:

$$\begin{aligned} |q/p| &= 0.93^{+0.09}_{-0.08} \\ \phi &= \left(-8.7^{+8.7}_{-9.1}\right)^\circ . \end{aligned}$$

Those values allow for the presence of direct CPV in suppressed decays. If it is assumed that there is no direct CPV in DCS decays[‖] [20], these constraints are

[¶] CP-odd final states can also be used, with suitable changes to the formulae.

[‖] This is certainly true for charm in the SM, and is also true in many but not all models of NP on the market. However, we should be a little cautious simply because there have been few experimental tests of this.

strengthened considerably:

$$\begin{aligned} |q/p| &= 1.007^{+0.015}_{-0.014} \\ \phi &= (-0.30^{+0.58}_{-0.60})^\circ. \end{aligned}$$

As with the mixing parameters, these represent a great improvement on the state of play as of CKM 2012. It is now clear that we do not have $\mathcal{O}(1)$ indirect CPV in charm. If direct CPV is negligible in DCS decays—and the excellent agreement with the null hypothesis seems to back this up—then $\mathcal{O}(10^{-1})$ is also excluded and even $\mathcal{O}(10^{-2})$ is not far away. We have not yet reached the SM level, which is estimated to be $\mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$ to $\mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$ [21, 22, 23], but it looms ahead in the distance. On the plus side, it is dominated by short-distance physics so is a more theoretically tractable problem than direct CP violation.

4 Direct CPV

While indirect CPV is not quite universal in the SM—CPV in the interference between mixing and decay in general depends on the final state—it can be expressed in terms of a small number of parameters with modest assumptions. The story is very different for direct CPV, where the asymmetry can vary greatly from one decay mode to another. Both within the SM and in general models of NP, the largest asymmetries are expected in SCS modes [24] where interference between penguin and tree diagrams can be substantial, and this is where both experimental and theoretical interest has been focused. Direct CPV in DCS charm decays is possible in certain models of NP but negligible in the SM; the experimental precision is necessarily poorer than for SCS decays simply because of the reduced branching fractions. In CF decays, direct CPV is negligible even in the presence of NP since the favoured tree diagram dominates.

There was considerable excitement at the time of CKM 2012: LHCb had seen indications of direct CPV at 3.5σ in $\Delta A_{CP} = A_{CP}(D^0 \to K^+K^-) - A_{CP}(D^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-)$ with $0.6\,\text{fb}^{-1}$ of prompt charm data [25]. CDF and Belle reported similar central values after analysing their full data sets [26, 27], giving a world average of $\Delta A_{CP}^{\text{dir}} = (-0.678 \pm 0.147)\%$. The effect was studied in numerous theory papers (e.g. [28, 29, 30, 31]), both in the context of the SM and of various models of NP. The consensus was that direct CPV of order 0.5% in these final states could be accommodated within the SM if the penguin amplitude is large, which is allowed and would be consistent with the unusual pattern of branching fractions [$\mathcal{B}(D^0 \to K^+K^-) > \mathcal{B}(D^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-)$]. Since CKM 2012, LHCb has released three new results which have brought the world average much closer to zero: an update of the prompt charm measurement to $1\,\text{fb}^{-1}$ [32], a measurement with charm produced in semileptonic B decays with $1\,\text{fb}^{-1}$ [33], and an update of the latter measurement to $3\,\text{fb}^{-1}$ [34]. With these new

results, the HFAG average [9] is $\Delta A_{CP}^{\rm dir} = (-0.253 \pm 0.104)\%$, consistent with zero CPV.

As well as updating the ΔA_{CP} measurement, the $3\,{\rm fb}^{-1}$ LHCb paper mentioned above [34] also quoted values for the individual asymmetries $A_{CP}(D^0 \to K^+K^-)$ and $A_{CP}(D^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-)$. Because the pp initial state at LHCb is not charge antisymmetric (in the way that an e^+e^- or $p\overline{p}$ collision is), measuring these asymmetries requires correcting for production and efficiency asymmetries. These were obtained from a careful combination of control modes, extending a technique that had been used previously at LHCb [35, 15]. This is a promising development for future measurements at LHCb.

Numerous other results on CPV have been reported or published since CKM 2012, from CLEO [36], BaBar [37, 38], Belle [39, 40] and LHCb [35, 41, 42, 43, 44]. None report a significant CP asymmetry. While there is not space here to discuss all of these measurements, there are a couple of points worth noting. One is that the analysis technology used to study CP asymmetries in multi-body is advancing rapidly. Model-independent techiques were pioneered in 3-body decays with studies of binned Dalitz plots [45, 46] and have proven their sensitivity in B decay modes to similar final states [47]. However, there is always a question as to how to choose the binning: the optimal choice depends on the model of CP violation. Unbinned methods [48] are now being applied. These are especially interesting for decays to four-body (or more!) final states, where a tradiational binned analysis (e.g. [42]) runs swiftly into the curse of dimensionality. Another item worth singling out is the new Belle result on $A(D^0 \to \pi^0\pi^0)$ [39]. This is an analysis that LHCb cannot hope to do, and is an excellent example of the complementarity between hadron and e^+e^- experiments that we will see in the Belle-II/LHCb upgrade era.

All of this experimental progress is very good news: multiple two-body decay modes reaching precisions well below 1% and closing in on 10^{-3}, and searches for CPV in the phase space of multi-body decays with signal yields in the millions. The theoretical side, however, remains unclear: one key lesson from ΔA_{CP} is that direct CP asymmetries can arise at the $\mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$ level in the SM, and as much as $\mathcal{O}(\text{few} \times 10^{-3})$ can be accommodated. We have already reached this level of precision, so in the absence of a major advance in theoretical engineering it seems like we would not be able to say whether some future observation of direct CPV in a generic SCS mode at the 0.1%-level is SM physics or not. A path forward has been suggested: to combine information from $SU(3)$-related final states, testing whether the overall pattern is consistent with the SM [49]. Alternatively, effort can be focused on modes where the SM contribution is suppressed (e.g. SCS modes with $\Delta I = 3/2$ [30]).

One last note: charmed baryons are also produced at significant rates at LHCb [50], and good-sized samples have been accumulated at the B-factories. Their decays are also sensitive to direct CPV, but measurements of this are sorely lacking.

5 The future

From an experimental point of view, the coming years will be a very exciting time for charm physics. At the time of writing, the LHC is near the end of a long shutdown during which the machine is upgraded to operate at $\sqrt{s} \approx 13\,\text{TeV}$. Data-taking is scheduled to resume in 2015, with Run 2 lasting around three years. During this time LHCb will integrate about 5–6 fb^{-1}. This will give the charm statistics a major boost: the new data should correspond to about twice the current integrated luminosity, at a higher energy (i.e. nearly twice the production cross-section), with an improved software trigger. Indirect CPV measurements in $D^0 \to h^+h'^-$ with this sample will have an exciting level of sensitivity to NP. In parallel, Belle II will begin commissioning in 2015 and should start to integrate luminosity in earnest around 2018. Another LHC shutdown is planned around 2018–2019, during which the LHCb detector will be upgraded to allow a factor 5–10 increase in instantaneous luminosity. In total, LHCb intends to integrate about 50 fb^{-1}, and Belle II 50 ab^{-1}. (Note that the cross-sections at the two colliders are different, such that the LHCb sample corresponds to more $c\overline{c}$ pairs produced.)

Both experiments have published estimates of their long-run physics sensitivity [51, 52]. While such estimates should be treated with a degree of caution**, we can expect an improvement of at least an order of magnitude in the uncertainties on charm CP asymmetries. There is good complementarity between the two experiments: the sheer statistics at LHCb will pin down key observables in decays to $D^0 \to h^+h'^-$ and $D^+_{(s)} \to h^+h'^+h''^-$ final states; Belle II will give us depth, opening up many modes that LHCb struggles with; and redundancy between the two will validate our control over systematic uncertainties.

Last but not least, we can look forward to new results from charm-at-threshold experiments such as BESIII. These are one of the only sources of information on the strong phases δ that feed into the mixing average discussed in Section 2. In particular, separate measurements of the strong phase in Dalitz plot bins for $D^0 \to K^0_S h^+h^-$ allows for model-independent measurements of x and y [53, 54] at LHCb and Belle II.

6 Measurements reported during CKM 2014

These proceedings are based on a talk given in the opening session. Several new experimental results, listed below, were reported during the conference. For more details please consult the proceedings from those talks.

- Measurements of A_Γ in $D^0 \to K^+K^-$, $\pi^+\pi^-$ at CDF [55]. Combining the two modes, an average value of $A_\Gamma = (-0.12 \pm 0.12)\%$ was reported. Presented by L. Sabato.

** This in a spirit of optimism: "more data makes us smarter".

- A time-integrated search for CPV in $D^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ at LHCb [56]. An unbinned, model-independent method was used with a sample of approximately 0.6M signal. No evidence for CPV was reported, with a p-value for consistency with the null hypothesis of $(2.6 \pm 0.5)\%$. Presented by E. Gersabeck.

- Preliminary results from BaBar on P, C, and CP violation in 4-body D decays, following a method proposed recently [57] to reinterpret existing measurements of T-odd correlations. Presented by M. Martinelli.

7 Conclusions

There has been an enormous amount of progress in the past two years, with new results from several experiments. After a ramp-up, the LHCb charm machine is now in high gear, producing a steady stream of measurements. We can look forward to a similar flow from Belle II in the not-too-distant future.

After a burst of excitement, ΔA_{CP} now looks firmly consistent with the Standard Model once again. The same is true across the board in charm: we find no evidence of anything amiss. The game is far from over, however: we can expect a jump in precision for indirect CPV in the next few years, followed by steady progress as the LHCb upgrade takes data. We are still operating in a regime where the SM is—at least in principle—safely below current sensitivity to indirect CPV, so that any observation would point to NP. For direct CPV the situation is less clear, so all we can do is plough ahead, measure as much as we can in as many modes as we can, and try to make sense of whatever nature decides to give us.

References

[1] S. L. Glashow, J. Iliopoulos, and L. Maiani, *Weak interactions with lepton-hadron symmetry*, Phys. Rev. **D2** (1970) 1285.

[2] BaBar Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, *Evidence for D^0-$\overline{D}^0$ mixing*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98** (2007) 211802, `arXiv:hep-ex/0703020`.

[3] Belle Collaboration, M. Staric *et al.*, *Evidence for D^0-$\overline{D}^0$ mixing*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98** (2007) 211803, `arXiv:hep-ex/0703036`.

[4] A. F. Falk *et al.*, *The D^0-$\overline{D}^0$ mass difference from a dispersion relation*, Phys. Rev. **D69** (2004) 114021, `arXiv:hep-ph/0402204`.

[5] A. A. Petrov, *Long-distance effects in charm mixing*, `arXiv:1312.5304`.

[6] S. Bianco, F. L. Fabbri, D. Benson, and I. Bigi, *A Cicerone for the physics of charm*, Riv. Nuovo Cim. **26N7** (2003) 1, arXiv:hep-ex/0309021.

[7] M. Bobrowski, A. Lenz, and T. Rauh, *Short distance D^0-$\overline{D}^0$ mixing*, arXiv:1208.6438.

[8] E. Golowich, J. Hewett, S. Pakvasa, and A. A. Petrov, *Implications of D^0-$\overline{D}^0$ mixing for new physics*, Phys. Rev. **D76** (2007) 095009, arXiv:0705.3650.

[9] Heavy Flavor Averaging Group, Y. Amhis *et al.*, *Averages of b-hadron, c-hadron, and tau-lepton properties as of early 2012*, arXiv:1207.1158.

[10] Particle Data Group, K. A. Olive *et al.*, *Review of particle physics*, Chin. Phys. **C38** (2014) 090001.

[11] Belle Collaboration, T. Peng *et al.*, *Measurement of D^0-$\overline{D}^0$ mixing and search for indirect CP violation using $D^0 \to K^0_S\pi^+\pi^-$ decays*, Phys. Rev. **D89** (2014) 091103, arXiv:1404.2412.

[12] Belle Collaboration, B. R. Ko *et al.*, *Observation of D^0-$\overline{D}^0$ mixing in e^+e^- collisions*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112** (2014) 111801, arXiv:1401.3402.

[13] CDF Collaboration, T. A. Aaltonen *et al.*, *Observation of D^0-$\overline{D}^0$ mixing using the CDF II detector*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111** (2013) 231802, arXiv:1309.4078.

[14] LHCb Collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, *Observation of D^0-$\overline{D}^0$ oscillations*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110** (2013) 101802, arXiv:1211.1230.

[15] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, *Measurement of D^0-$\overline{D}^0$ mixing parameters and search for CP violation using $D^0 \to K^+\pi^-$ decays*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111** (2013) 251801, arXiv:1309.6534.

[16] BESIII Collaboration, M. Ablikim *et al.*, *Measurement of the $D \to K^-\pi^+$ strong phase difference in $\psi(3770) \to D^0\overline{D}^0$*, Phys. Lett. **B734** (2014) 227, arXiv:1404.4691.

[17] BESIII Collaboration, X.-R. Lu, *Measurements of strong phase in $D^0 \to K\pi$ decay and $y_{\rm CP}$ at BESIII*, arXiv:1311.3411.

[18] M. Gersabeck *et al.*, *On the interplay of direct and indirect CP violation in the charm sector*, J. Phys. **G39** (2012) 045005, arXiv:1111.6515.

[19] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, *Measurements of indirect CP asymmetries in $D^0 \to K^-K^+$ and $D^0 \to \pi^-\pi^+$ decays*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112** (2014) 041801, arXiv:1310.7201.

[20] A. L. Kagan and M. D. Sokoloff, *On indirect CP violation and implications for D^0-$\overline{D}^0$ and B_s^0-$\overline{B}_s^0$ mixing*, Phys. Rev. **D80** (2009) 076008, arXiv:0907.3917.

[21] I. I. Bigi, *No pain, no gain: On the challenges and promises of charm studies*, arXiv:0907.2950.

[22] M. Bobrowski, A. Lenz, J. Riedl, and J. Rohrwild, *How large can the SM contribution to CP violation in D^0-$\overline{D}^0$ mixing be?*, JHEP **1003** (2010) 009, arXiv:1002.4794.

[23] M. Bobrowski, *Charm mixing in the Standard Model: the inclusive approach*, arXiv:1302.4208.

[24] Y. Grossman, A. L. Kagan, and Y. Nir, *New physics and CP violation in singly Cabibbo suppressed D decays*, Phys. Rev. **D75** (2007) 036008, arXiv:hep-ph/0609178.

[25] LHCb Collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, *Evidence for CP violation in time-integrated $D^0 \to h^-h^+$ decay rates*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108** (2012) 111602, arXiv:1112.0938.

[26] CDF Collaboration, T. Aaltonen *et al.*, *Measurement of the difference of CP–violating asymmetries in $D^0 \to K^+K^-$ and $D^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ decays at CDF*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109** (2012) 111801, arXiv:1207.2158.

[27] Belle, B. R. Ko, *Direct CP violation in charm at Belle*, PoS **ICHEP2012** (2013) 353, arXiv:1212.1975.

[28] J. Brod, Y. Grossman, A. L. Kagan, and J. Zupan, *A consistent picture for large penguins in $D \to \pi^+\pi^-$, K^+K^-*, JHEP **1210** (2012) 161, arXiv:1203.6659.

[29] T. Feldmann, S. Nandi, and A. Soni, *Repercussions of flavour symmetry breaking on CP violation in D-meson decays*, JHEP **1206** (2012) 007, arXiv:1202.3795.

[30] B. Bhattacharya, M. Gronau, and J. L. Rosner, *CP asymmetries in singly-Cabibbo-suppressed D decays to two pseudoscalar mesons*, Phys. Rev. **D85** (2012) 054014, arXiv:1201.2351.

[31] G. Isidori, J. F. Kamenik, Z. Ligeti, and G. Perez, *Implications of the LHCb evidence for charm CP violation*, Phys. Lett. **B711** (2012) 46, arXiv:1111.4987.

[32] LHCb collaboration, *A search for time-integrated CP violation in $D^0 \to K^-K^+$ and $D^0 \to \pi^-\pi^+$ decays*, LHCb-CONF-2013-003.

[33] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, *Search for direct CP violation in $D^0 \to h^-h^+$ modes using semileptonic B decays*, Phys. Lett. **B723** (2013) 33, arXiv:1303.2614.

[34] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, *Measurement of CP asymmetry in $D^0 \to K^-K^+$ and $D^0 \to \pi^-\pi^+$ decays*, JHEP **1407** (2014) 041, arXiv:1405.2797.

[35] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, *Search for CP violation in $D^+ \to \phi\pi^+$ and $D_s^+ \to K_S^0\pi^+$ decays*, JHEP **1306** (2013) 112, arXiv:1303.4906.

[36] CLEO Collaboration, G. Bonvicini *et al.*, *Updated measurements of absolute D^+ and D^0 hadronic branching fractions and $\sigma(e^+e^- \to D\overline{D})$ at $E_{\rm cm} = 3774$ MeV*, Phys. Rev. **D89** (2014) 072002, arXiv:1312.6775.

[37] BaBar Collaboration, J. P. Lees *et al.*, *Search for CP violation in the decays $D^\pm \to K_S^0K^\pm$, $D_s^\pm \to K_S^0K^\pm$, and $D_s^\pm \to K_S^0\pi^\pm$*, Phys. Rev. **D87** (2013) 052012, arXiv:1212.3003.

[38] BaBar Collaboration, J. P. Lees *et al.*, *Search for direct CP violation in singly Cabibbo-suppressed $D^\pm \to K^+K^-\pi^\pm$ decays*, Phys. Rev. **D87** (2013) 052010, arXiv:1212.1856.

[39] Belle Collaboration, N. K. Nisar *et al.*, *Search for CP violation in $D^0 \to \pi^0\pi^0$ decays*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112** (2014) 211601, arXiv:1404.1266.

[40] Belle Collaboration, B. R. Ko *et al.*, *Search for CP violation in the decay $D^+ \to K_S^0K^+$*, JHEP **1302** (2013) 098, arXiv:1212.6112.

[41] LHCb Collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, *Search for CP violation in $D^\pm \to K_{\rm S}^0K^\pm$ and $D_s^\pm \to K_{\rm S}^0\pi^\pm$ decays*, JHEP **1410** (2014) 25, arXiv:1406.2624.

[42] LHCb Collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, *Model-independent search for CP violation in $D^0 \to K^-K^+\pi^-\pi^+$ and $D^0 \to \pi^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$ decays*, Phys. Lett. **B726** (2013) 623, arXiv:1308.3189.

[43] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, *Search for CP violation in the decay $D^+ \to \pi^-\pi^+\pi^+$*, Phys. Lett. **B728** (2014) 585, arXiv:1310.7953.

[44] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, *Search for CP violation using T-odd correlations in $D^0 \to K^+K^-\pi^+\pi^-$ decays*, JHEP **1410** (2014) 5, arXiv:1408.1299.

[45] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, *Search for CP violation in neutral D meson Cabibbo-suppressed three-body decays*, Phys. Rev. **D78** (2008) 051102, arXiv:0802.4035.

[46] I. Bediaga *et al.*, *On a CP anisotropy measurement in the Dalitz plot*, Phys. Rev. **D80** (2009) 096006, arXiv:0905.4233.

[47] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, *Measurements of CP violation in the three-body phase space of charmless $B^\pm$ decays*, arXiv:1408.5373.

[48] M. Williams, *How good are your fits? Unbinned multivariate goodness-of-fit tests in high energy physics*, JINST **5** (2010) P09004, arXiv:1006.3019.

[49] G. Hiller, M. Jung, and S. Schacht, *SU(3)-flavor anatomy of non-leptonic charm decays*, Phys. Rev. **D87** (2013) 014024, arXiv:1211.3734.

[50] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, *Prompt charm production in pp collisions at sqrt(s)=7 TeV*, Nucl. Phys. **B871** (2013) 1, arXiv:1302.2864.

[51] T. Aushev *et al.*, *Physics at Super B Factory*, arXiv:1002.5012.

[52] LHCb Collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, *Implications of LHCb measurements and future prospects*, Eur. Phys. J. **C73** (2013) 2373, arXiv:1208.3355.

[53] CLEO Collaboration, J. Libby *et al.*, *Model-independent determination of the strong-phase difference between D^0 and $\overline{D}^0 \to K^0_{S,L}h^+h^-$ ($h = \pi, K$) and its impact on the measurement of the CKM angle γ/ϕ_3*, Phys. Rev. **D82** (2010) 112006, arXiv:1010.2817.

[54] C. Thomas and G. Wilkinson, *Model-independent $D^0 - \overline{D^0}$ mixing and CP violation studies with $D^0 \to K^0_S\pi^+\pi^-$ and $D^0 \to K^0_S K^+K^-$*, JHEP **1210** (2012) 185, arXiv:1209.0172.

[55] CDF Collaboration, T. A. Aaltonen *et al.*, *Measurement of indirect CP-violating asymmetries in $D^0 \to K^+K^-$ and $D^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ decays at CDF*, Phys. Rev. Lett. (2014) arXiv:1410.5435.

[56] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, *Search for CP violation in $D^0 \to \pi^-\pi^+\pi^0$ decays with the energy test*, arXiv:1410.4170.

[57] A. J. Bevan, *C, P, and CP asymmetry observables based on triple product asymmetries*, arXiv:1408.3813.